

Remarks

In the Office Action mailed June 26, 2009 claims 1-5, 16-20, and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kedda, USP 4,222,759 in view of Gurta, USP 3,912,534, because “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the laminated-glass waste disclosed by Gurta in the method for making a glass product disclosed by Kedda.” The examiner further stated “it would have been obvious to use the laminated-glass waste, which is used as the starting material in Gurta’s invention, as raw material in the method of Kedda.”

To overcome this rejection the applicant further amended independent claims 1 and 16, and cancelled claims 3 and 18. Claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claim 3, and claim 16 was amended to include the limitations of claim 18. The claim 3 and claim 18 limitations relate to the laminated glass comprising cracks.

As currently amended, independent claims 1 and 16 now require the laminated glass to be cracked. It would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use cracked laminated-glass waste in the method for making a glass product disclosed by Kedda. If the laminated-glass waste, which is used as the starting material in Gurta’s invention, was cracked, one of ordinary skill in the art would not use it in the method for making a glass product disclosed by Kedda, simply because it was cracked.

However, even if one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention used cracked laminated-glass waste in the method for making a glass product disclosed by Kedda, they would not arrive at the present invention for the at least the following four reasons.

Reason 1: Kedda’s method requires at least a double thickness of glass, while the present invention requires at least two layers of laminated glass. Two layers of laminated glass are equivalent to a quadruple thickness of glass, because each layer of laminated glass consists of two layers of glass. Example 1 of the present invention demonstrates that if only one piece of

laminated glass (two layers of glass) is used, then grooves will extend all the way through the product, which is undesirable. Example 2 demonstrates that when two pieces of laminated glass (four layers of glass) are stacked, then the grooves in the top surface do not extend through the product as occurred in Example 1.

The detailed description of the present invention also discusses the importance of stacking two or more pieces of laminated glass (equal to four or more layers of glass): “Stacking and heating two or more pieces together provides a unique feature compared to if only one piece was processed. The cracks in a single piece extend through the piece, but when two are more pieces are stacked together, the cracks only extend through the entire stack where the cracks in each piece overlap. Because each piece has a different random pattern of cracks, the overlap of cracks between the pieces is limited. Stacking two of more pieces and limiting the overlap of cracks between the pieces, reduces the amount of glass flow needed during the fusing process to produce a continuous glass product.”

Kedda does not teach that four layer of glass (two layers of laminated glass) are required as discussed above in the present invention. Kedda teaches that at least a double thickness of glass is required. Processing a double thickness of glass consisting of two layers of cracked glass (one layer of laminated glass) by the method of Kedda will produce undesirable results, as discussed in example 1 of the present invention.

Reason 2: Kedda’s method requires “gluing together with a heat destructible glue first and second glass pieces” (see claim 1). The present invention does not require the use of glue or a gluing step. The present invention requires stacking two of more pieces of cracked laminated glass (equal to four layers of glass). The two layers of glass in the laminated-glass pieces are already bonded together with a plastic interlayer, however glue or a gluing step are not required to bond the two pieces of laminated glass together prior to firing. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not conclude from Kedda’s method that glue or a gluing step are not required as is the case in the present invention.

Reason 3: Kedda's method requires "first and second glass pieces with the same contours" (see claim 1). In the present invention the contours of the two pieces of laminated glass do not need to be the same, as is required for the glass pieces in Kedda's method. The examples in the present invention used laminated glass from windshields, which usually comprise curved glass. Two pieces of laminated glass from a curved windshield usually will not have the same contours, as is required in Kedda's method. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would conclude that laminated glass pieces with different contours would not be suitable in Kedda's method, and most of the windshield glass would not be useful.

Reason 4: Kedda's method requires the second piece of glass being smaller than the first piece of glass (see claim 1). In the present invention "preferably, all of the pieces have about the same dimensions" (see second sentence in the eighth paragraph of the Detailed Description of the Invention). This difference further demonstrates how one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would not arrive at the present invention from the use of laminated glass in the method of Kedda.

The applicant therefore believes that amended independent claims 1 and 16 are now in condition for allowance, and thus the remaining dependent claims as amended are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and therefore requests reconsideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Haun

Date: September 25, 2009

P.O. Box 47
Ninole, HI 96773

Tel: 808-963-6213